

## Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 10/750,608 First Named Applicant: David C. Hastings  
Examiner: George Monikang Art Unit: 2614 Status of Application: Non-Final Rejection

### Tentative Participants:

(1) Ex. George Monikang (2) Atty. Christopher M. Scherer  
(3) \_\_\_\_\_ (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Proposed Date of Interview: 02/24/2009 Proposed Time: 2:00 EST AM PM

### Type of Interview Requested:

(1) ☒ Telephonic (2) ☐ Personal (3) ☐ Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☒ YES ☐ NO

If yes, provide brief description: Proposed Claim 1 Amended

### Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) <u>Rej. §103</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>Statview/Brown</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

☒ Continuation Sheet Attached

### Brief Description of Argument to be Presented:

The Applicants respectfully thank Examiner Monikang for his willingness to interview this case. During the interview, the Applicants plan to discuss the proposed amendments to the independent claim 1, and further arguments from the previous Office Action Response. Specifically, the Applicants respectfully submit that they believe [Cont'd on page 2]

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on \_\_\_\_\_.

**NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).**

**This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.**

Christopher M. Scherer  
Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature

Christopher M. Scherer

Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative  
50,655

Registration Number, if applicable

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner/SPE Signature

## Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form (Continuation Sheet)

Application No.: 10/750,608

First Named Applicant: David C. Hastings

Examiner: George Monikang

Art Unit: 2614

Status of Application: Non-Final Rejection

### Issues to be Discussed (Continued)

Issues	Claims/ Fig. #'s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(5) _____	_____	_____	[   ]	[   ]	[   ]
(6) _____	_____	_____	[   ]	[   ]	[   ]
(7) _____	_____	_____	[   ]	[   ]	[   ]
(8) _____	_____	_____	[   ]	[   ]	[   ]
(9) _____	_____	_____	[   ]	[   ]	[   ]
(10) _____	_____	_____	[   ]	[   ]	[   ]

### Continuation of Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:

Examiner Monikang did not consider the amendments made to the independent claims in the previous Office Action Response properly. This is evidenced by the current Office Action, where the reasoned rejections on page 3 failed to include the limitations added to the independent claim 1 that include a notification transmitter, WLAN transceiver, and a cellular network transceiver, all configured to receive the alert from the notification server and transfer the notification message to a portable electronic device. For clarification, the Applicants include the proposed amended claim 1.

Referring to Figure 1 of the present application, the Applicants respectfully submit that what the Applicant is attempting to claim and describe in the response and amended claims is that the system of the present application includes a notification server 52 that is capable of sending an alert to a caregiver receiver 58, 60, 62, using any of a cellular network 42 notification transmitter 40 or WLAN access point 33. In other words, this system is capable of transmitting alerts to the same caregiver receiver using a number of different protocols. Neither Statview, Brown, nor their combination teach this type of architecture and functionality. The Applicant looks forward to discussing all of these points with the Examiner during the Examiner interview on Tuesday, February 24. Again, the Applicants respectfully thank the Examiner for his kind attention and willingness to interview this case.